UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,146	06/24/2003	Hoyong Lee	Lee 2-1-3	9878

23307   7590   06/14/2007
SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER, LLP
1101 MARKET STREET
26TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107-2950

EXAMINER
NUNEZ, JORDANY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/602,146	LEE ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Jordany Núñez	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 April 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948).

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-6, 8-10, 12-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Rajarajan et al. (US6950990, hereinafter Rajarajan) in view of Bocioned et al. (US20020093537,

hereinafter Bocioned).

As to claims 1, 8, 9, 12, 18,

Rajarajan shows a method for displaying Web-based pages on a display device; one or

more corresponding computer-readable media comprising computer executable instructions that,

when executed, direct a computer; and a corresponding system, comprising a memory

comprising a set of computer-executable instructions and a processor coupled to the memory, the

processor configured to execute the computer-executable instructions that, when executed, direct

a computer; (e.g., see abstract) said method, said corresponding computer-readable media, and

said corresponding system comprising:

displaying Web-based pages on a display device (column 2, lines 58-66), each Web-

based display page comprising:

a first area (figure 5, element 506) that provides an ordered (Applicant fails to define this

term, thus Examiner interprets this as "logical or comprehensible") list of user-selectable tasks

(e.g., controls) associated with performing provisioning hardware resources (e.g., "objects

relating to specific hardware units") in a network (column 15, lines 2-11; column 8, lines 25-36);

and a second area (figure 5, element 504) containing display information and/or

parameter fields associated with a particular one of the user-selectable tasks, such that when a

particular one of the user-selectable tasks is selected from the first area, information and/or

parameter fields necessary to complete operations associated with the particular one of the user-

selectable tasks are presented in the second area (column 15, lines 12-21).

Rajarajan fails to specifically show: said first area containing a graphical workflow

indicator.

In the same field of invention of web page navigation of task oriented processes,

Bocioned teaches: a user interface supporting navigation and concurrent application operation.

Bocioned further teaches: Subtasks being implemented within corresponding tabbed web task

pages, visible tabs (e.g., tabs are a form of controls) being associated with each individual tabbed

subtask web page and incorporating an identifier (i.e., graphical workflow indicator) identifying the function provided by the subtask web page (page 3, paragraph [0026], lines 1-4).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Rajarajan and Bocioned at the time that the invention was made, to have combined the subtasks being implemented within corresponding tabbed web task pages, visible tabs being associated with each individual tabbed subtask web page and incorporating an identifier identifying the function provided by the subtask web page of Bocioned with the method, corresponding computer-readable media, and corresponding system as taught by Rajarajan.

One would have been motivated to make such combination because a way to simplify network implementation of business to business and business to consumer interaction for commercial transactions and **other purposes** would have been obtained and desired, as expressly taught by Bocioned (page 2, paragraph [0016], lines 12-14).

As to claims 2, 10, 13, 19, Bocioned shows:

Wherein each of the user-selectable tasks contains a hypertext link to a particular one of the pages to enable a user to navigate through the ordered list of user selectable tasks associated with performing the provisioning of the network (abstract, lines 15-18).

As to claims 3, 14, 20:

Rajarajan and Bocioned show a method, corresponding computer-readable media, and corresponding system substantially as claimed, as specified above.

Bocioned further shows: Wherein the graphical workflow indicator includes an alphabetic indicator (e.g., nomenclature within the tab, for example, "BROWSE", "SEARCH") configured to specify (i) which user-selectable task is currently selected by the user, and (ii) where within the ordered list the user-selectable task falls (page 4, paragraph [0029], lines 8-14).

Rajarajan and Bocioned fail to specifically show: the graphical workflow indicator includes a **numeric** indicator.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and do not alter how the indicator functions (i.e., the nonfunctional descriptive material does not prevent the indicator from specifying). Thus, this nonfunctional descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

As to claims 4, 15, 21:

Rajarajan and Bocioned show a method, corresponding computer-readable media, and corresponding system substantially as claimed, as specified above.

Bocioned further shows: Wherein the display information includes a map (page 1, paragraph [0004], lines 14-16).

Rajarajan and Bocioned fail to specifically show: Wherein the display information includes a map of a network.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and do not alter how the map is displayed (i.e., the nonfunctional descriptive material does not

reconfigure the display). Thus, this nonfunctional descriptive material will not distinguish the

claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381,

1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed.

Cir. 1994).

As to claims 5, 16, 22, Rajarajan shows:

wherein the parameter fields are configured to display information entered by a user

(column 15, lines 12-21).

As to claims 6, 17, 23, Rajarajan shows:

Wherein the parameter fields (figure 5, element 504 is a form) are configured to provide

locations to receive information entered by a user, the information being appurtenant to the user-

selectable task (column 15, lines 12-21).

Claims 7, 11, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Rajarajan in view of Bocioned, further in view of Raymond (US7010593).

As to claim 7, 11, 24:

Rajarajan and Bocioned shows a method, corresponding computer-readable media, and

corresponding system substantially as claimed, as specified above.

Rajarajan further shows: a console including a tool bar and three zones (figure 12,

column 28, lines 30-33) and parameters being extrapolated, by the framework from the context

of the user interface when a particular script is invoked (column 21, lines 64-67).

Rajarajan and Bocioned fails to specifically show: further comprising displaying a third

area simultaneously with the first and second areas, the third area including at least one tip

presented to a user to assist in completing one of the user-selectable tasks selected by the user.

In the same field of invention, Raymond teaches: method for dynamically providing

information that is relevant to a particular problem to an administrator (abstract, lines 1-3).

Raymond further teaches: a problem event being received; contextual instructions pertinent to

troubleshooting the type of problem event received being generated; contextual diagnostic data

pertinent to the type of problem event being generated; said instructions and diagnostic data

being displayed to the network administrator on a display device for network administrator

viewing (figure 7, column 19, line 65 through column 19, line 9); and a view window having a

plurality of data windows for facilitating optimal display of display space (figure 13, column 21,

lines 34-45), and including instructions (e.g., tips) displayed in a data display window (column

27, line 10-14).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings

of Rajarajan, Bocioned and Raymond at the time that the invention was made, to have combined

the a problem event being received; contextual instructions pertinent to troubleshooting the type

of problem event received being generated; contextual diagnostic data pertinent to the type of

problem event being generated; said instructions and diagnostic data being displayed to the

network administrator on a display device for network administrator viewing; and a view

window having a plurality of data windows for facilitating optimal display of display space, and

including instructions (e.g., tips) displayed in a data display window of Raymond with the

method, corresponding computer-readable media, and corresponding system as taught by

Rajarajan and Bocioned.

One would have been motivated to make such combination because a way to decrease the

likelihood that an administrator will misdiagnose a problem in the evaluation of a network

problem event would have been obtained and desired, as expressly taught by Raymond (column

2, lines 48-52).

References to specific columns, figures or lines should not be limiting in any way. The

entire reference provides disclosure related to the claimed invention.

Response to Arguments

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of claims 1-24

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Examiner

reiterates that references to specific columns, figures or lines should not be limiting in any way.

The entire reference provides disclosure related to the claimed invention. Applicant argues that:

1) In contrast to the presently claimed invention, nothing in Rajarajan teaches or suggests

provisioning hardware resources in a network. Provisioning hardware resources in a computer

network is not the same as monitoring workspaces and altering information related to the

workspaces and their respective users. Rather, as defined in the specification of the present

invention, provisioning relates to specifying an array of information to enable two network

elements to be linked. Rajarajan is merely managing information related to these network

elements. (page 11, paragraph starting with "However, and in [...]").

Examiner disagrees.

As to 1), as pointed out in claim 1, Rajarajan does teach a list of user-selectable tasks

(e.g., controls) associated with performing provisioning of resources (e.g., objects) (column 15,

lines 2-11), said resources being hardware resources (column 8, lines 25-36).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR ,1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure:

Gallagher et al.   [U.S. 6314449]

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jordany Núñez whose telephone number is (571)272-2753. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Through Thursday 9am-7:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571)272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JN
5/30/2007

WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER